The Limits of Entanglement

Chad Orzel

Union College Deartment of Physics and Astronomy, Schenectady, NY 12308

arXiv:1208.6186v1 [quant-ph] 30 Aug 2012

Abstract

Quantum entanglement is one of the most intriguing phenomena in physics, but many presentations of the subject leave a false impression that it provides a sort of "remote control" for changing the state of a distant particle by local manipulation of its entangled partner. We discuss a simple example, suitable for undergraduate quantum mechanics classes, showing that this is false, and demonstrating the limits of entanglement.

The idea of quantum entanglement was introduced very early in the development of quantum mechanics, most clearly in the famous Einstein, Podolsky, and Rosen paper of 1935[1], but closely related ideas were involved in the famous debates between Bohr and Einstein at the 1927 and 1930 Solvay conferences. The full implications of the idea weren't worked out until John Bell showed in 1964 that EPR-type entanglement implied correlations between the states of widely separated particles that are fundamentally non-local[2]. Non-local correlations in EPR-type systems was first demonstrated experimentally by Freedman and Clauser in 1972[3], then in a series of experiments by Alain Aspect in 1981-2[4,5], and numerous other experimental and theoretical treatments have continued to refine our understanding of EPR and entanglement[6]. In recent years, development of parametric downconversion sources has even brought these experiments within reach of a well-equipped undergraduate laboratory[7].

The notion of non-local correlations of the type described by EPR and Bell is sufficiently unintuitive to seem almost magic, and as a result, entanglement has captured the popular imagination like few other aspects of quantum theory. The issues involved are sufficiently subtle, though, that many attempts at understanding the phenomenon cross the line between science and the supernatural[8]. Numerous attempts have been made to devise a system for superluminal communication using entangled particles[9], and even to use entanglement as an explanation for psychic phenomena[10] or alternative medicine[11]. As Kaiser argues[8], debunking these arguments, particularly Ref.[9], helped spur research into quantum foundations leading to developments like no-cloning[12] and no-signaling[13,14] theorems, direct experimental tests[15], and a deeper understanding of quantum information and relativity[16]. Still, misconceptions regarding the nature of entanglement persist, and remain a source of frustration for many physicists.

One particularly tenacious misconception stems from mistaking the correlation between the outcomes of measurements on an entangled pair of particles for an absolute connection between the states of two particles. Entanglement, in this view, provides a sort of "remote control," by which manipulations of the state of one particle are instantaneously reflected in changes of the state of its entangled partner an arbitrary distance away. This derives from statements of the form\ "the measurement of one particle instantaneously determines the state of the other," which are common in introductory discussions of EPR and entanglement. Popular treatments sometimes take this to absurd extremes, as in a 2012 article whose author

imagines applying "quantum" physics to golf, and being able to direct the path of a ball in flight by manipulating an entangled partner ball back on the tee[17]. This misconception also underlies most invocations of entanglement as an explanation for psychic phenomena, through the claim that all particles were once in the same position, and thus must be entangled, allowing the manipulation of particles in a psychic's brain to alter the states of other objects[10]. Similar arguments have been used to explain "alternative medicine" techniques such as homeopathy[11], an area which is genuinely problematic as it promotes the use of medically dubious remedies. This even trips up some authors who ought to know better, as confusion about entanglement was central to the Internet controversy over statements made by Brian Cox[18] in promoting his book with Jeff Forshaw[19].

The notion of entanglement as a remote control for a distant particle can easily be shown to be false by careful consideration of a simple example, which could easily be used when the idea is first introduced in an undergraduate course, or directly demonstrated using the apparatus of Ref.[7]. To be concrete, we will consider the case of two polarization-entangled photons, though a similar argument will work for other sorts of entangled systems.

We begin with two photons, A and B, entangled so that they have opposite polarizations, sent to widely separated polarization-sensitive detectors. Using vertical ($|V\rangle$) and horizontal ($|H\rangle$) polarizations as the basis states, we can write:

$$\Psi_{HV} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|V\rangle_A|H\rangle_B - |H\rangle_A|V\rangle_B) \tag{1}$$

This is the classic example of a maximally entangled state, as a measurement of the state of photon A allows one to predict with certainty the state of photon B, no matter where it is located. If we detect photon A with vertical polarization, photon B will always be horizontally polarized, and vice versa.

We can, of course, transform this state into another basis, for example using left- or right-hand circular polarization:

$$|R\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|V\rangle + i|H\rangle) \tag{2}$$

$$|L\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|V\rangle - i|H\rangle) \tag{3}$$

Re-writing the initial state Ψ in the new basis, we find that the entanglement is exactly preserved:

$$\Psi_{RL} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|R\rangle_A|L\rangle_B - |L\rangle_A|R\rangle_B) \tag{4}$$

When we detect Photon A with right-hand circular polarization, photon B will always have left-hand circular polarization, and so on.

To explore the idea of entanglement as remote control, we consider a simple modification: inserting a quarter-wave plate before the detector for photon A. The waveplate rotates the state vectors from one basis into the other, so $|V\rangle \rightarrow |R\rangle$ and $|H\rangle \rightarrow |L\rangle$. The idea of entanglement as a remote control would hold that rotating the state of photon A should produce a corresponding rotation in photon B. That is, by rotating the state of photon A from $|V\rangle$ to $|R\rangle$, the state of photon B should rotate from $|H\rangle$ to $|L\rangle$, preserving the correlation between states.

After the waveplate insertion, the state of the two-photon system is:

$$\Psi_{rot} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|R\rangle_A|H\rangle_B - |L\rangle_A|V\rangle_B) \tag{5}$$

re-writing this in the circular polarization basis, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{rot} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[|R\rangle_A\frac{-i}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|R\rangle_B - |L\rangle_B\right) - |L\rangle_A\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|R\rangle_B + |L\rangle_B\right)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(-i|R\rangle_A|R\rangle_B + i|R\rangle_A|L\rangle_B - |L\rangle_A|R\rangle_B - |L\rangle_A|L\rangle_B\right)\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

This state includes all four possible combinations of polarizations for A and B, and thus will not produce the correlations characteristic of an entangled state. When we detect photon A with right-hand circular polarization, photon B is equally likely to have either right-hand or left-hand circular polarization.

We can also look at the effect of the polarizer on measurements in original the $|V\rangle - |H\rangle$ basis, where we find

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{rot} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|V\rangle_A + i|H\rangle_A\right)|H\rangle_B - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|V\rangle_A - i|H\rangle_A\right)|V\rangle_B\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(|V\rangle_A|H\rangle_B - i|H\rangle_A|H\rangle_B - |V\rangle_A|B\rangle_B + i|H\rangle_A|V\rangle_B\right)\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Again, after the state rotation, the correlations characteristic of entanglement are destroyed. When we detect photon A with vertical polarization, photon B is equally likely to have either horizontal or vertical polarization. It is clear, then, that manipulation of the state of photon A has not produced a corresponding change in the state of photon B.

Looking at the results of Eq.6 and Eq.7, one might be tempted to say that inserting the quarter-wave plate has destroyed the initial entanglement, but this would be an overstatement (albeit in the opposite direction from the original exaggerated claims). Inspection of Eq.5 shows that the correlation between the states of photons A and B remains, provided the measurements of the two polarizations are made in different bases. When photon A is found to have right-hand circular polarization, photon B will always be found to have horizontal polarization, and vice versa.

While this example uses polarization states for simplicity, similar arguments will hold for any pair of entangled particles: electron spins, qubit states of atoms or ions, or even continuous variables such as position or momentum. A local modification of the state of one particle changes the measurement bases needed to observe non-local correlations, but does not directly modify the state of the entangled partner.

Entanglement between states, once established, is very robust, provided one chooses the appropriate measurement bases. In a narrow technical sense, then, there is some truth to the seemingly absurd claim that two arbitrarily chosen particles may be entangled by virtue of having been close together shortly after the Big Bang. Observing such entanglement, however, let alone exploiting it in some paranormal manner, would require complete knowledge of all state-rotating interactions for each of the two particles over the intervening 13.7 billion years, so as to choose the correct measurement bases to reveal the correlation.

The derivation of equations 6 and 7 is well suited to class discussion or a homework assignment in an undergraduate quantum mechanics course. Discussion of this scenario can both help head off some common misconceptions about entanglement, and also illuminate some of the subtle issues that make entanglement and non-locality such a fascinating topic of study. For the philosophically inclined, this can also provide an entry point for discussions of different versions of quantum mechanics[20]; while the final results will be the same for all, the underlying process will be decribed in different very terms depending on whether the wavefunction is viewed as a real object or merely a description of our knowledge about the state of the system.

Acknowledgments

A version of this argument was originally presented on my blog (http://scienceblogs.com/principles/2012/03/14/entanglement-is-not-that-magic/). Thanks to Matt Leifer for helpful discussions.

---

[1] Einstein, A., B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, 1935, Phys. Rev. 47, 777.

[2] Bell, J. S., 1964, Physics Long Island City, N.Y. 1, 195.

[3] Freedman, S. J., and J. F. Clauser, 1972, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28, 938.

[4] Aspect, A., P. Grangier, and G. Roger, 1981, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 460.

[5] Aspect, A., J. Dalibard, and G. Roger, 1982, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 1804.

[6] Reid, M. D. et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 81, 1727 (2009).

[7] Galvez, E. J. et al., Am. J. Phys. 73, 127 (2005).

[8] Kaiser, David, How the Hippies Saved Physics, W. W. Norton (New York), 2011.

[9] Herbert, Nick, Foundations of Physics 12, 1171(1982).

[10] A good bookstore will provide many examples in the New Age section, among them: Deepak Chopra, Ageless Body, Timeless Mind (Harmony, 1994); Jack Angelo, Distant Healing (Sounds True 2008); Tiffany Snow, Forward From the Mind: Distant Healing, Bilocation, Medical Intuition & Prayer in a Quantum World (Spirit Journey Boooks 2006).

[11] Lionel R. Milgrom, Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine 4, 7-16 (2006).

[12] Wootters, W. K., and W. H. Zurek, 1982, Nature London 299, 802.

[13] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini and T. Weber Lettere Al Nuovo Cimento (1971 – 1985) 27, 293 (1980).

[14] D. Bruss et al., Phys. Rev. A 62, 062302 (2000)

[15] T. De Angelis et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 193601 (2007)

[16] Peres, A. and D. R. Terno, Rev. Mod. Phys. 76, 93 (2004).

[17] "Ben Bova: Quantum Physics," Naples Daily News, August 19, 2012 (http://www.naplesnews.com/news/2012/aug/19/ben-bova/).

[18] A god overview of the controversy was written for the Guardian's science section by Jon Butterworth: "On Pauli and the interconnectedness of all things," posted Feb. 28, 2012: http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/life-and-physics/2012/feb/28/1 (accessed Aug. 28, 2012).

[19] Brian Cox and Jeff Forshaw, The Quantum Universe: Everything that Can Happen Does Happen, Da Capo Press 2012.

[20] D. F. Styer et al., Am. J. Phys. 70, 288 (2002);